



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,915	11/02/2001	Anthony J. Mauro	460.2115USU	7768

7590 05/06/2003

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

WEBB, JAMISUE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,915

Applicant(s)

MAURO ET AL.

Examiner

Jamisque A. Webb

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3761

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 18, 20-22 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Swanson (5,783,502).
3. With respect to Claims 1-3, 18, 20-22 and 37: Swanson discloses the use of a sheet material that can be used for things such as wound coverings, dressings, sponges and surgical articles (column 4, lines 36-49), where in the absorbent (see Claims 1 and 6), where the fabric is coated with an antiviral compound that is made up of quaternary ammonium groups such as alkyl ammonium compounds (column 6, lines 56-64), and a finishing compound that is used to immobilize the antiviral coating (column 7, lines 19-24).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3761

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 4-11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 23-32, 35-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson. (5,783,502) in view of Merritt (6,245,361).

7. With respect to Claims 4-6, 23, 25 and 26: Swanson discloses the use of quaternary ammonium compounds, but fails to disclose a specific compound. Merritt discloses the use of an antibacterial compound for use on skin (column 3, lines 58-62), that contains a bactericidal quaternary ammonium comprises mixtures of alkyl dimethyl benzylammonium chloride and alkyl dimethyl ethylbenzylammonium chloride (see Column 6, lines 52-60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the antibacterial agent of the antiviral coating of Swanson be replaced with the antibacterial compound that contains the mixtures of alkyl dimethyl benzylammonium chloride and alkyl dimethyl ethylbenzylammonium chloride, as disclosed by Merritt, in order to provide an antiviral composition that are effective in use at places such as hospitals, and medical clinics, and does not produce a harsh smell in order to be tolerable to people (see Columns 1 and 5).

8. With respect to Claims 7-9, 12, 24, 27 and 28: Swanson discloses the quaternary ammonium compounds being used in percentages 1 and 4% (see Table 2) of the composition, but

Art Unit: 3761

fails to disclose the ammonium compounds being 1-4% of entire absorbent product. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the quaternary ammonium compounds being 1-4% weight of the absorbent product, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

9. With respect to Claim 10-14, 17, 29-32 and 35-36: Merritt discloses the quaternary ammonium compounds include less than 15% of a surfactant that can be nonionic (column 7, lines 18-35).

10. With respect to Claims 19 and 38: See Merritt column 7, lines 50-55.

11. Claims 15, 16, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson and Merrit as applied to claims 1, 13, 14, 20, 31 and 32 above, and further in view of Hama et al (5,817,844)..

12. With respect to Claims 15, 16, 33, and 34: Merritt discloses the use of less than 25% of a surfactant and discloses the surfactant to be preferably nonionic, but fails to disclose the surfactant being a polyoxyethylene fatty acid ester. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have to have the nonionic surfactant of Merritt be polyoxyethylene, since it is known in the surfactant art, as demonstrated by Hama, that polyoxyethylene is a common and well used nonionic surfactant. (See Hama abstract and column 1, lines 7-20).

***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments filed 2/19/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. With respect to Applicant's arguments that Swanson does not disclose the antibacterial agent and the immobilizing agent have a synergistic effect: Even though Swanson does not specifically use the word synergistic does not mean that they do not provide a synergistic effect. Swanson discloses the claimed compound, the antibacterial agent and immobilizing agent, and therefore it would be inherent that the two would provide the synergistic effect. Furthermore, Swanson discloses that the immobilizing agent and the antibacterial compounds result in a localized surfactancy capable of disrupting liquid-enveloped viruses upon contact with the substrate, therefore they work together to provide a result and have a synergistic effect. Swanson also discloses the same antibacterial agent as what is claimed therefore it fully capable of neutralizing the bacteria.

15. With respect to Applicant's arguments that Swanson and Merritt cannot combined due to the fact that Merritt discloses the use of the disinfectant in industrial situations: Where as this may be true, the examiner is only replying on the Merritt reference for the use of the antibacterial, quaternary ammonium compound, which Merritt states is a good antibacterial agent for the use in medical field. The examiner is not replacing the entire compound of Swanson with the compound of Merritt, the examiner is only taking the antibacterial compound from Merritt. The part of the compound that makes it for use in an industrial situation is the use of bleach, however the bleach is not relied upon or being used in the combination of references. Therefore

Art Unit: 3761

it is the examiner's position that the combination of references has motivation, therefore rejection stands as stated above.

16. With respect to applicant's arguments about the percentage of the agents. These arguments are moot in view of the new rejection made above.


17. Applicant is arguing all other rejections based on the fact that the combination of materials of Swanson does not disclose the synergistic effect as claimed. As stated above, the examiner considers Swanson and Merritt to inherently have this synergistic effect, therefore arguments are not persuasive and rejections stand as stated above.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamisue A. Webb whose telephone number is (703) 308-8579. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 - 4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (703)308-1957. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

jaw   
May 1, 2003

  
WEILUN LO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700